arXiv:1512.03637v1 [math.LO] 11 Dec 2015

A note on bases of admissible rules of proper axiomatic extensions of Łukasiewicz logic

Joan Gispert
Universitat de Barcelona

email:jgispertb@ub.edu

Abstract

In this note we prove that single-conclusion admissible rules of any proper axiomatic extension of the infinite valued Łukasiewicz logic are finitely based. The proof strongly relies on the characterization of least **V**-quasivarieties given in [10].

Introduction.

Admissible rules of a logic are those rules under which the set of theorems are closed. If L is a logic, an *L-unifier* of a formula φ is a substitution σ such that $\vdash_L \sigma\varphi$. A *single-conclusion rule* is an expression of the form Γ/φ where φ is a formula and Γ is a finite set of formulas. As usual Γ/φ is derivable in L iff $\Gamma \vdash_L \varphi$. The rule Γ/φ is *admissible* in L iff every common L-unifier of Γ is also an L-unifier of φ. Γ/φ is *passive L-admissible* iff Γ has no common L-unifier. We say that a logic is *structurally complete* iff every admissible rule is a derivable rule. Roughly speaking, a logic is structurally complete iff every proper finitary extension must contain new theorems, as opposed to nothing but new rules of inference (see for instance [1, 17, 22]). Every logic L has a unique structurally complete extension L' with same theorems of L [1]. In particular, structural completeness can be seen as a kind of maximality condition on a logic. We say that a logic is *almost structurally complete* iff every admissible rule is either derivable rule or passive. It follows from a result of Dzik [7] that every finite valued Łukasiewicz logic is almost structurally complete. Jeřábek uses this result [14, Corollary 3.7] to obtain for every $n > 2$, one rule that axiomatizes admissible rules of the n-valued Łukasiewicz logic. In [15] the same author proves that admissible rules of the infinite valued Łukasiewicz calculus $\mathrm{Ł}_\infty$ are not finitely based, moreover

he explicitly constructs an infinite base of single-conclusion admissible rules for Ł$_\infty$. The purpose of this work is to obtain a basis of single-conclusion rules of every proper axiomatic extension of Ł$_\infty$. Admissibility theory normally uses proof-theoretic techniques, however in this case we will take an algebraic approach taking advantage of the algebraization of Ł$_\infty$. In fact for algebraizable logics there is a analogous algebraic notion of admissible quasiequations and structurally complete and almost structurally complete quasivarieties (see for instance [1, 22]).

It is well known that Ł$_\infty$ is algebraizable and the class of MV-algebras **MV** is its equivalent algebraic quasivariety semantics [21]. It follows from the algebraization, that quasivarieties of **MV** are in 1-1 correspondence with finitary extensions of Ł$_\infty$. Actually, there is a dual isomorphism from the lattice of all quasivarieties of **MV** and the lattice of all finitary extensions of Ł$_\infty$. Moreover if we restrict this correspondence to varieties of **MV** we get the dual isomorphism from the lattice of all varieties of **MV** and the lattice of all axiomatic extensions of Ł$_\infty$. Given an axiomatic extension L of Ł$_\infty$ whose equivalent variety semantics is $\mathbf{V}_L$, single-conclusion admissible rules of L can be seen as valid quasiequations in the $\mathbf{V}_L$-free algebra under a countable set of generators $F_{\mathbf{V}_L}(\omega)$ in the following sense: $\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_n/\varphi$ is L-admissible if and only if $\gamma_1 \approx 1 \& \cdots \& \gamma_n \approx 1 \Rightarrow \varphi \approx 1$ is valid in $F_{\mathbf{V}_L}(\omega)$ [22]. Hence the algebraic study of admissible rules of L is the study of $\mathcal{Q}(F_{\mathbf{V}_L}(\omega))$ the quasivariety generated by $F_{\mathbf{V}_L}(\omega)$. The quasivariety $\mathcal{Q}(F_{\mathbf{V}_L}(\omega))$ is the least quasivariety that generates $\mathbf{V}_L$ as a variety. These quasivarieties were studied in [10], where a Komori's type characterization is accomplished. In this paper we will prove that $\mathcal{Q}(F_{\mathbf{V}_L}(\omega))$ is the class of bipartite algebras of the least quasivariety generated by MV-chains that generates $\mathbf{V}_L$ as a variety. We use this result to prove that admissible rules for any proper axiomatic extension of Ł$_\infty$ are finitely based and finally we give an effective axiomatization for each one.

The paper is organized as follows. First, in Section 1 we introduce the necessary definitions, notation and preliminary results on Universal Algebra and MV-algebra Theory that we use throughout the paper. Section 2 is first devoted to survey already existing results on varieties and quasivarieties of MV-algebras and later to obtain principal algebraic results: Theorems 2.4 and 2.6. Finally, Section 3 contains the main theorem, Theorem 3.4, where we built a finite basis for each axiomatic extension of Ł$_\infty$.

1 Definitions and first properties.

We assume the reader is familiar with Universal Algebra [2, 13]. To fix notation we denote by $\mathcal{I}$, $\mathcal{H}$, $\mathcal{S}$, $\mathcal{P}$, $\mathcal{P}_R$ and $\mathcal{P}_U$ the operators *isomorphic image, homomorphic image, substructure, direct product, reduced product and ultraproduct* respectively. We recall that a class $\mathbf{K}$ of algebras is a *variety* if and only if it is closed under $\mathcal{H}$, $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{P}$. A class $\mathbf{K}$ of algebras is a *quasivariety* if and only if it is closed under $\mathcal{I}$, $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{P}_R$, or equivalently, under $\mathcal{I}$, $\mathcal{S}$, $\mathcal{P}$ and $\mathcal{P}_U$. A class $\mathbf{K}$ of algebras is a *universal class* if and only if it is closed under $\mathcal{I}$, $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{P}_U$. Given a class $\mathbf{K}$ of algebras, the *variety generated by* $\mathbf{K}$, denoted by $\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{K})$, is the least variety containing $\mathbf{K}$. Similarly, the *quasivariety generated by a class* $\mathbf{K}$, which we denote by $\mathcal{Q}(\mathbf{K})$, is the least quasivariety containing $\mathbf{K}$. $\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{K})$ denotes the *universal class generated by* $\mathbf{K}$, that is the least universal class containing $\mathbf{K}$. We also recall that a class $\mathbf{K}$ of algebras is a variety if and only if it is an equational class; $\mathbf{K}$ is a quasivariety if and only if it is a quasiequational class; $\mathbf{K}$ is a universal class if and only if $\mathbf{K}$ is definable by first order universal sentences.

An *MV-algebra* is an algebra $\langle A, \oplus, \neg, 0\rangle$ satisfying the following equations:

MV1 $(x \oplus y) \oplus z \approx x \oplus (y \oplus z)$

MV2 $x \oplus y \approx y \oplus x$

MV3 $x \oplus 0 \approx x$

MV4 $\neg(\neg x) \approx x$

MV5 $x \oplus \neg 0 \approx \neg 0$

MV6 $\neg(\neg x \oplus y) \oplus y \approx \neg(\neg y \oplus x) \oplus x$.

We write 1 instead of $\neg 0$, $x \odot y$ instead of $\neg(\neg x \oplus \neg y)$ and $a \to b$ instead of $\neg a \oplus b$. Further, for all $n \in \omega$, where ω is the set of all natural numbers, and $x \in A$, the MV-operations nx and x^n are inductively defined by

$$0x = 0, \quad (n+1)x = x \oplus (nx)$$

and

$$x^0 = 1, \quad x^{n+1} = x \odot (x^n).$$

Following tradition we assume that the operation x^n takes precedence over any other operation; also $\neg$ takes precedence over $\odot$, $\odot$ takes precedence over $\oplus$, and $\oplus$ takes precedence over $\to$.

As shown by Chang [3], for any MV-algebra A, the stipulation $a \leq b$ iff $a \to b = 1$ endows A with a bounded distributive lattice-order $\langle A, \vee, \wedge, 0, 1\rangle$, called the *natural order* of A.

$$x \vee y =_{def} \neg(\neg x \oplus y) \oplus y.$$

$$x \wedge y =_{def} \neg(\neg x \vee \neg y).$$

An MV-algebra whose natural order is total is said to be an *MV-chain*.

We recall that a *lattice-ordered abelian group* (for short, ℓ-group) is an algebra $\langle G, \wedge, \vee, +, -, 0\rangle$ such that $\langle G, \wedge, \vee\rangle$ is a lattice, $\langle G, +, -, 0\rangle$ is an abelian group and satisfies the following equation:

$$(x \vee y) + z \approx (x + z) \vee (y + z)$$

For any ℓ-group G and element $0 < u \in G$, let $\Gamma(G, u) = \langle [0, u], \oplus, \neg, 0\rangle$ be defined by

$$[0, u] = \{a \in G \,|\, 0 \leq a \leq u\}, \quad a \oplus b = u \wedge (a + b), \quad \neg a = u - a.$$

Then, $\langle [0, u], \oplus, \neg, 0\rangle$ is an MV-algebra. Further, for any ℓ-groups G and H with elements $0 < u \in G$ and $0 < v \in H$, and any ℓ-group homomorphism $f : G \to H$ such that $f(u) = v$, let $\Gamma(f)$ be the restriction of f to $[0, u]$. An element $0 < u \in G$ is called a *strong unit* iff for each $x \in G$ there is an integer $n \geq 1$ such that $x \leq nu$. Then, as proved in [19], (see also [5]) Γ is a categorical equivalence from the category of ℓ-groups with strong unit, with ℓ-homomorphisms that preserve strong units, onto the category of MV-algebras with MV-homomorphisms. Moreover the functor Γ preserves embeddings and epimorphisms.

The following MV-algebras play an important role in the paper.

- $[0, 1] = \Gamma(\mathbb{R}, 1)$, where $\mathbb{R}$ is the totally ordered group of the reals.
- $[0, 1] \cap \mathbb{Q} = \Gamma(\mathbb{Q}, 1) = \langle \{\frac{k}{m} : k \leq m < \omega\}, \oplus, \neg, 0\rangle$, where $\mathbb{Q}$ is the totally ordered abelian group of the rationals.

For every $0 < n < \omega$

- $\mathrm{L}_n = \Gamma(\mathbb{Z}, n) = \langle \{0, 1, \ldots, n\}, \oplus, \neg, 0\rangle$, where $\mathbb{Z}$ is the totally ordered group of all integers. Notice that L_n is isomorphic to the subalgebra of $[0, 1]$ given by $\{0, \frac{1}{n}, \frac{2}{n}, \ldots, \frac{n-1}{n}, 1\}$.

- $\mathrm{L}_n^\omega = \Gamma(\mathbb{Z} \times_{lex} \mathbb{Z}, (n,0)) = \langle \{(k,i) : (0,0) \leq (k,i) \leq (n,0)\}, \oplus, \neg, 0\rangle$, where $\times_{lex}$ denotes the lexicographic product.
- $\mathrm{L}_n^s = \Gamma(\mathbb{Z} \times_{lex} \mathbb{Z}, (n,s)) = \langle \{(k,i) : (0,0) \leq (k,i) \leq (n,s)\}, \oplus, \neg, 0\rangle$, where $s \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $0 \leq s < n$. Notice that $\mathrm{L}_n^\omega = \mathrm{L}_n^0$.

As usual, by an *ideal* of an MV-algebra A we mean the kernel I of a homomorphism h of A into some MV-algebra B. In other words, $0 \in I$, I is closed under the $\oplus$ operation, and $x \leq y \in I$ implies $x \in I$. We denote by $I(A)$ the set of all ideals of A.

An ideal is *prime* iff it is the kernel of a homomorphism of A into an MV-chain. We denote by $Spec(A) = \{I \in I(A) : I \text{ is prime}\}$. An ideal is *maximal* iff it is the kernel of a homomorphism of A into $[0,1]$. We denote by $\mathcal{M}(A) = \{I \in I(A) : I \text{ is maximal}\}$. The *radical of* A denoted by $Rad(A)$ is the intersection of all maximal ideals of A. Notice that when A is an MV-chain $\mathcal{M}(A) = \{Rad(A)\}$ and $Rad(A) = \{a \in A : a^k \neq 0 \text{ for all } k > 0\}$.

An MV-algebra is said to be *bipartite* iff there is $I \in I(A)$ such that $A/I \cong \mathrm{L}_1$.

2 Varieties and quasivarieties of MV-algebras

Since the class of all MV-algebras is definable by a set of equations, it is a variety that we denote by **MV**. By Chang's Completeness Theorem [4] (see also [5]), **MV** is the variety generated by the MV-algebra $[0,1]$ (or $[0,1] \cap \mathbb{Q}$), in symbols,

$$\mathbf{MV} = \mathcal{V}([0,1]) = \mathcal{V}([0,1] \cap \mathbb{Q}).$$

Proper subvarieties of **MV** are well known. Komori proves the following characterization

Theorem 2.1 [16, Theorem 4.11] **V** *is a proper subvariety of* **MV** *if and only if there exist two disjoint finite subsets* I, J *of positive integers, not both empty such that*

$$\mathbf{V} = \mathcal{V}(\{\mathrm{L}_i : i \in I\} \cup \{\mathrm{L}_j^\omega : j \in J\}). \qquad \square$$

A pair (I,J) of finite subsets of positive integers, not both empty is said to be *reduced* iff for every $n \in I$, there is no $k \in (I \setminus \{n\}) \cup J$ such that $n|k$ and for every $m \in J$, there is no $k \in J \setminus \{m\}$ such that $m|k$. In [20] Panti shows that there is a 1-1 correspondence between proper subvarieties of **MV** and

reduced pairs of finite subsets of positive integers not both empty. Given a reduced pair (I, J), we denote by $\mathcal{V}_{I,J}$ its associated subvariety. Moreover for every reduced pair (I, J) there is a single equation in just one variable of the form $\alpha_{I,J}(x) \approx 1$ axiomatizing $\mathcal{V}_{I,J}$.

Quasivarieties of MV-algebras have been studied by this author in [11, 12, 9, 10]. Particularly in [9], the author finds a characterization, classification an axiomatization of every quasivariety generated by MV-chains. Moreover he obtains necessary condition for finitely axiomatization that yields to the following result:

Theorem 2.2 *Every quasivariety generated by MV-chains contained in a proper subvariety of* $\mathbf{MV}$ *is finitely axiomatizable*

Let $\mathbf{V}$ a variety of any type of algebras, a quasivariety $\mathbf{K}$ of same type is a $\mathbf{V}$-*quasivariety* provided that $\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{K}) = \mathbf{V}$. It follows from the work in [9] that $\mathcal{Q}^1_{I,J} := \mathcal{Q}(\{\mathrm{L}_m \mid m \in I\} \cup \{\mathrm{L}^1_n \mid n \in J\})$ is the least $\mathcal{V}_{I,J}$-quasivariety generated by chains. However $\mathcal{Q}^1_{I,J}$ is not the least $\mathcal{V}_{I,J}$-quasivariety. In fact, for any variety $\mathbf{V}$, not necessarily of MV-algebras, the least $\mathbf{V}$-quasivariety is $\mathcal{Q}(F_{\mathbf{V}}(\omega))$. In [10] we study least $\mathbf{V}$-quasivarieties and we obtain the following characterization.

Theorem 2.3 [10, Theorem 4.8] *Let* (I, J) *be a reduced pair. Then* $\mathcal{Q}_{I,J} := \mathcal{Q}(\{\mathrm{L}_1 \times \mathrm{L}_m \mid m \in I\} \cup \{\mathrm{L}_1 \times \mathrm{L}^1_n \mid n \in J\})$ *is the least* $\mathcal{V}_{I,J}$*-quasivariety.*

Next result establishes the relation between least $\mathbf{V}$-quasivarieties of MV-algebras and least $\mathbf{V}$-quasivarieties generated by chains.

Theorem 2.4 $\mathcal{Q}_{I,J}$ *is the class of all bipartite algebras in* $\mathcal{Q}^1_{I,J}$

Proof: Let $BPQ^1_{I,J}$ be the class of all all bipartite algebras in $\mathcal{Q}^1_{I,J} = \mathcal{Q}(\{\mathrm{L}_m \mid m \in I\} \cup \{\mathrm{L}^1_n \mid n \in J\})$. Since being bipartite is preserved under $\mathcal{I}$, $\mathcal{S}$, $\mathcal{P}$ and $\mathcal{P}_U$ and $\{\mathrm{L}_1 \times \mathrm{L}_m \mid m \in I\} \cup \{\mathrm{L}_1 \times \mathrm{L}^1_n \mid n \in J\} \subseteqq BPQ^1_{I,J}$, then $\mathcal{Q}_{I,J} = \mathcal{ISPP}_U(\{\mathrm{L}_1 \times \mathrm{L}_m \mid m \in I\} \cup \{\mathrm{L}_1 \times \mathrm{L}^1_n \mid n \in J\}) \subseteqq BPQ^1_{I,J}$.
In order to prove the other implication, let $A \in BPQ^1_{I,J}$. Let $\Delta = \{I \in Spec(A) : A/I \in \mathcal{Q}(\{\mathrm{L}_m \mid m \in I\} \cup \{\mathrm{L}^1_n \mid n \in J\})\}$. Since $\mathcal{Q}(\{\mathrm{L}_m \mid m \in I\} \cup \{\mathrm{L}^1_n \mid n \in J\})$ is relative congruence distributive quasivariety, Δ induces a natural subdirect representation of A: $A \hookrightarrow_{SD} \prod_{I \in \Delta} A/I : a \mapsto (a/I)_{I \in \Delta}$ where each A/I is an MV-chain of $\mathcal{Q}(\{\mathrm{L}_m \mid m \in I\} \cup \{\mathrm{L}^1_n \mid n \in J\})$. Since A is bipartite there exists $I \in \Delta$ such that $A/I \cong \mathrm{L}_1$. Thus $A \in \mathcal{ISP}(\{\mathrm{L}_1 \times B \mid B \in K\})$ where $K = \{A/I \mid I \in \Delta \text{ and } A/I \ncong \mathrm{L}_1\}$. Since

B is an MV-chain of $\mathcal{Q}^1_{I,J}$, then $B \in \mathcal{ISP}_U(\{\mathrm{L}_m \mid m \in I\} \cup \{\mathrm{L}^1_n \mid n \in J\}) = \bigcup_{m\in I} \mathcal{IS}(\mathrm{L}_m) \cup \bigcup_{n\in J} \mathcal{ISP}_U(\mathrm{L}^1_n)$. Thus for every $B \in K$, $\mathrm{L}_1 \times B \in \bigcup_{m\in I} \mathcal{IS}(\mathrm{L}_1 \times \mathrm{L}_m) \cup \bigcup_{n\in J} \mathcal{ISP}_U(\mathrm{L}_1 \times \mathrm{L}^1_n) \subseteq \mathcal{Q}_{I,J}$. □

In [18], G. Metcalfe and C. Röthlisberger give the following characterization of almost structurally complete quasivarieties

Theorem 2.5 [18, Theorem 4.10] *Let* $\mathbf{K}$ *be a quasivariety. The following are equivalent for any* $B \in \mathcal{S}(F_{\mathbf{K}}(\omega))$

1. $\mathbf{K}$ *is almost structurally complete.*
2. $\mathcal{Q}(\{A \times B : A \in \mathbf{K}\}) = \mathcal{Q}(F_{\mathbf{K}}(\omega))$.
3. $\{A \times B : A \in \mathbf{K}\} \subsetneqq \mathcal{Q}(F_{\mathbf{K}}(\omega))$.

Theorem 2.6 *Let* (I, J) *be a reduced pair. Then* $\mathcal{Q}(\{\mathrm{L}_n : n \in I\} \cup \{\mathrm{L}^1_m : m \in J\})$ *is almost structurally complete.*

Proof: Since $F_{\mathcal{V}_{I,J}}(\omega) = F_{\mathcal{Q}(\{\mathrm{L}_n : n\in I\}\cup\{\mathrm{L}^1_m : m\in J\})}(\omega)$ and L_1 is a subalgebra of $F_{\mathcal{V}_{I,J}}(\omega)$, by previous theorem it is enough to prove that $A \times \mathrm{L}_1 \in \mathcal{Q}(F_{\mathcal{V}_{I,J}}(\omega)) = \mathcal{Q}_{I,J}$ for every $A \in \mathcal{Q}(\{\mathrm{L}_n : n \in I\} \cup \{\mathrm{L}^1_m : m \in J\})$. Trivially $A \times \mathrm{L}_1$ is a bipartite member of $\mathcal{Q}(\{\mathrm{L}_n : n \in I\} \cup \{\mathrm{L}^1_m : m \in J\}) = \mathcal{Q}^1_{I,J}$. Then, by Theorem 2.4, $A \times \mathrm{L}_1 \in \mathcal{Q}_{I,J}$ concluding the proof. □

3 Bases of admissible rules

From the algebraization of $\mathrm{Ł}_\infty$ we obtain a 1 to 1 correspondence between quasivarieties of MV-algebras and finitary extensions of $\mathrm{Ł}_\infty$. In fact given a finitary extension L, L is also algebraizable and its equivalent quasivariety semantics is its associated quasivariety. Viceversa if K is a quasivariety of MV-algebras the logic $\models_K$ is its associated finitary extension, where $\models_K$ is defined as follows $\Gamma \models_K \varphi$ iff for every $A \in K$ and every evaluation $e : Prop(X) \to A$ if $e[\Gamma] = \{1\}$ then $e(\varphi) = 1$. Moreover there is a translation from formulas to equations and a translation from equations to formulas that allows to obtain an quasiequational axiomatization of a quasivariety K from the axiomatization of its associated finitary extension, and viceversa to get an axiomatization of a finitary extension L from the quasiequational axiomatization of its equivalent quasivariety semantics.

Jerabek in [15] gives an infinite axiomatization for all $\mathrm{Ł}_\infty$-admissible rules ad moreover he proves that they are not finitely based. Our purpose is

to obtain a base of all admissible rules for every proper axiomatic extension of Ł_∞. By Komori's classification of axiomatic extensions of Ł_∞ and Panti's correspondence [16, 20], every axiomatic extension is given by a reduced pair (I, J). Given a reduced pair (I, J) we denote by $L_{(I,J)}$ its associated axiomatic extension. Notice that $\mathcal{V}_{I,J}$ is the equivalent quasivariety semantics of $L_{I,J}$. Moreover since $\mathcal{V}_{I,J} = \mathcal{Q}(\{\text{L}_i : i \in I\} \cup \{\text{L}_j^\omega : j \in J\})$ (see [8]), we get the following finite strong completeness theorem:

$\varphi_1, \dots \varphi_n \vdash_{L_{I,J}} \varphi$ *if and only if* $\varphi_1, \dots \varphi_n \models_{\{\text{L}_i : i \in I\} \cup \{\text{L}_j^\omega : j \in J\}} \varphi$.

Lemma 3.1 *Let (I, J) be a reduced pair and $n = max\{maxI, maxJ + 1\}$. Then $\neg p^m \vdash_{L_{I,J}} \neg p^n$ for every $m > 0$*

Proof: By completeness $\neg p^m \vdash_{L_{I,J}} \neg p^n$ is equivalent to the following statement: *For every $A \in \{\text{L}_i : i \in I\} \cup \{\text{L}_j^\omega : j \in J\}$ and any $a \in A$, $a^m = 0$ implies $a^n = 0$* which is valid because $Rad(A) = \{a \in A : a^n \neq 0\}$ for every $A \in \{\text{L}_i : i \in I\} \cup \{\text{L}_j^\omega : j \in J\}$. □

In [14] the author gives a basis of single conclusion passive rules for every extension of BL.

Theorem 3.2 [14, Theorem 3.6]
If L is an extension of BL then $CC^1 = \{\neg(p \vee \neg p)^n / \bot : n > 1\}$ is a basis of single-conclusion passive L-admissible rules.

Theorem 3.3 *Admissible rules for proper axiomatic extensions of Ł_∞ are finitely based.*

Proof: By Theorem 2.6, every $L_{I,J}$-admissible rule is either derivable in $\models_{\mathcal{Q}^1_{I,J}}$ or it is a passive $L_{I,J}$-admissible rule. By Theorem 2.2, derivable rules in $\models_{\mathcal{Q}^1_{I,J}}$ are finitely axiomatizable. Moreover by Theorem 3.2 and Lemma 3.1 passive $L_{I,J}$-admissible rules are axiomatizable by $\neg(p \vee \neg p)^n / \bot$ where $n = max\{maxI, maxJ + 1\}$. □

Theorem 3.4 *Let (I, J) be a reduced pair, then a base of admissible rules for $\vdash_{I,J}$ is given by*

- *Ł1, Ł2, Ł3, Ł4 + M.P.*
- $\alpha_{I,J}(\gamma)$.
- $\Delta(Q_p) := [(\neg\varphi)^{p-1} \leftrightarrow \varphi] \vee [\psi \leftrightarrow \chi] \ / \ \psi \leftrightarrow \chi$
  for every prime number $p \in Div(J) \setminus Div(I)$

- $\Delta(U_q) := [(\neg\varphi)^{q-1} \leftrightarrow \varphi] \vee [\psi \leftrightarrow \chi] \ / \ \alpha_{Iq,\emptyset}(\gamma) \vee (\psi \leftrightarrow \chi)$
  for every prime number $q \in Div(I)$*, where* $I_q = \{n \in I : q|n\}$
- $CC^1_n := \neg(\varphi \vee \neg\varphi)^n / \ \bot$
  where $n = max\{maxI, maxJ + 1\}$

Proof: Following the proof of the previous theorem it is enough to put together the axiomatization of $\models_{\mathcal{Q}^1_{I,J}}$ plus CC^1_n where $n = max\{maxI, maxJ+1\}$. It follows from [9, Theorem 4.5] that $\models_{\mathcal{Q}^1_{I,J}}$ is axiomatized by

- Ł1, Ł2, Ł3, Ł4 + M.P.
- $\alpha_{I,J}(\gamma)$.
- $\Delta(Q_n)$ for every $n \in Div(J) \setminus Div(I)$
- $\Delta(U_m)$ for every $m \in Div(I)$
- $Q_n := (\neg\varphi)^{p-1} \leftrightarrow \varphi \ / \ \psi$
  for every $n \in Div(J) \setminus Div(I)$
- $U_m := (\neg\varphi)^{q-1} \leftrightarrow \varphi \ / \ \alpha_{Im,\emptyset}(\gamma)$ for every $m \in Div(I)$

We can avoid Q_n and U_m, since they are passive $L_{I,J}$-admissible rules, therefore derivable from CC^1_n. It enough to take $\Delta(Q_p)$ for every prime number $p \in Div(J) \setminus Div(I)$, and $\Delta(U_q)$ for every prime number $q \in Div(I)$ because $\Delta(Q_n)$ is derivable from $\Delta(Q_p)$ if $p|n$ and $\Delta(U_m)$ is derivable from $\Delta(U_q)$ if $q|m$. □

Acknowledgements: The author wishes to thank the anonymous referees for their suggestions that help to improve the presentation of this article. The author is partially supported by grants MTM2011-25747 of the Spanish Ministry of Education and Science, including FEDER funds of the European Union, the IRSES project MaToMUVI (PIRSES-GA-2009-247584) of the European Union and 2014SGR788 of Generalitat de Catalunya.

References

[1] Bergman, C. (1991) Structural completeness in algebra and logic, In: *Algebraic Logic,* volume 54 of *Colloq. Math. Soc. János Bolyai* North Holland, Amsterdam, p. 59-73.

[2] Burris, S., Sankappanavar, H.P. (1981) *A Course in Universal Algebra*. Springer Verlag. New York. Graduate Texts in Mathematics.

[3] Chang, C.C. (1958) Algebraic analysis of many-valued logics, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **88**, p. 467–490.

[4] Chang, C.C. (1959) A new proof of the completeness of the Łukasiewicz axioms, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **93**, p. 74–80.

[5] Cignoli, R., D'Ottaviano I.M.L., Mundici, D. (2000) *Algebraic Foundations of Many-valued Reasoning*. Kluwer, Dordrecht.

[6] Di Nola, A. (1993) MV-Algebras in the Treatment of Uncertainty, In: *Proceedings of the International IFSA Congress, Bruxelles 1991* (P. Löwen and E. Roubens, eds), Kluwer, Dordrecht, p. 123–131.

[7] Dzik, E. (2008) Unification of some substructural logics of BL-algebras and hoops. *Reports on Mathematical Logic*, **43**, p. 73-83.

[8] Gispert, J. (1998) Finitary extensions of the infinite valued Łukasiewicz calculus, *Ph.D. Thesis*, Universitat de Barcelona.

[9] Gispert, J (2002) Universal classes of MV-algebras with applications to many-valued logics, *Mathematical Logic Quarterly*, **48** , p. 581-601.

[10] Gispert, J (2014) Least V-quasivarieties of MV-algebras, *Journal of Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.fss.2014.07.011 .

[11] Gispert, J., Mundici, D. (2005) MV-algebras: a variety for magnitudes with archimedean units. *Algebra Universalis*, **53**, p. 7-43.

[12] Gispert, J., Mundici, D., Torrens, A. (1999) Ultraproducts of Z with an application to Many-Valued Logics. *Journal of Algebra*, **219**, p. 214-233.

[13] Gratzer, G. (1979) *Universal Algebra*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, second edition.

[14] Jerabek, E. (2010) Admissible rules of Łukasiewicz logic. *Journal of Logic and Computation*, **20**, p. 425-447.

[15] Jerabek, E. (2010) Bases of admissible rules of Łukasiewicz logic. *Journal of Logic and Computation*, **20**, p. 1149-1163.

[16] Komori, Y. (1981) Super-Łukasiewicz propositional logics. *Nagoya Mathematical Journal*, **84**, p. 119-133.

[17] Lorenzen, P. (1955) *Einfürung in die operative Logik und Mathematik*. Springer. Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, vol 78.

[18] Metcalfe, G. and Röthlisberger, C (2013) Admissibility in finitely generated quasivarieties. *Logical methods in Computer Science*, **9**, p. 1-19.

[19] Mundici, D. (1986) Interpretation of AF C^*-algebras in Łukasiewicz sentential calculus. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, **65**, p. 15-63.

[20] Panti, G. (1999) Varieties of MV-algebras, *Journal of Applied Non-classical Logic*, **9**, p. 141-157.

[21] Rodriguez, A.J., Torrens, A., Verdu, V. (1990) Łukasiewicz logic and Wajsberg algebras *Bull. Sec. Log. Polish Academy of Sciences*, **19**, p. 51-55.

[22] Rybakov, V.V. (1997) *Admissibility of logical Inference Rules* in Studies in logic and the foundations of Mathematics vol 36. Elsevier, Amsterdam.

Joan Gispert. Facultat de Matemàtiques, Universitat de Barcelona, Gran Via 585, 08007 Barcelona Catalonia
e-mail: jgispertb@ub.edu